

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-3, 7-14, and 18-21 have been previously presented and remain pending in the application. Claims 1 and 11 have been amended, claims 22 and 23 have been added, and claims 4-5 and 15-16 have been canceled. No new matter has been added. Examiner rejects claims 1-5, 7-16, and 18-21 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being obvious. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-3, 7-14, and 18-23 are not obvious over the cited references.

RESPONSE TO § 103 REJECTIONS

In the Office Action mailed April 20, 2006, the Examiner rejected claims 1-5, 7-16 and 18-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Abbott et al. (U.S. Patent 6,671, 808) (hereinafter, "Abbott"), and further in view of Burger (U.S. Pub. 2005/0060586) (hereinafter, "Burger").

EACH AND EVERY CLAIM LIMITATION MUST BE TAUGHT OR SUGGESTED

To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974). 'All words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art.' *In re Wilson*, 424 F.2d 1382, 1385, 165 USPQ 494, 496 (CCPA 1970). MPEP 2143.03

Applicant's independent claims include limitations not disclosed or suggested in Abbott nor Burger either alone or in combination. In particular, applicant's claims include ***"a storage medium coupled to the controller, wherein the storage medium is to include security information to be accessed by the controller, and said security information to include at least one of the identity of the individual, an***

Patent

Attorney's Docket No: 76706-201701/US(OS-16/2376P)

identifier for the device and identifying where the device has been used."

For example, Applicants' specification states that "information stored in the device

BEST AVAILABLE COPY